

### **REMARKS**

The Official Action mailed February 27, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on March 1, 2002; June 4, 2002; October 3, 2002; April 11, 2003; and December 16, 2003. A further Information Disclosure Statement was submitted on March 27, 2006, and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-26 and 35-62 are pending in the present application, of which claims 19, 35, 43 and 51 are independent. Claims 19 and 51 have been amended to correct minor typographical informalities. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.


The Official Action objects to the drawings "because the specification references figures 3A, 3B and 3C and there are no such figures" (page 2, Paper No. 022206). The Applicant notes that "Fig. 3(A)," "Fig. 3(B)" and "Fig. 3(C)" in page 9 of the present specification refer to curves (A), (B) and (C) shown in Figure 3. In order to clarify this matter, the Applicant has amended the specification to clarify that reference characters "(A)," "(B)" and "(C)" refer to curves (A), (B) and (C) of Figure 3, respectively. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

The Official Action rejects claims 19-26 and 35-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, asserting that "[there] is no support for an 'interlayer insulating film' having the properties claimed" (page 3, Paper No. 022206). The Official Action appears to be particularly concerned with "specific properties of carbon and halogen." The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the above-referenced assertions in the Official Action.

The specification discloses that in a silicon oxide insulating film,  $1 \times 10^{17}$  to  $5 \times 10^{20}$   $\text{cm}^{-3}$  of halogen is detected from the insulating film while the carbon concentration is  $5 \times 10^{19}$   $\text{cm}^{-3}$  or less, desirably  $1 \times 10^{18}$   $\text{cm}^{-3}$  or less (see, e.g., page 5, lines 14-19). Also, the specification discloses that a silicon oxide film is deposited as an interlayer insulating film (see, e.g., page 13, lines 21-25). Therefore, the specification clearly discloses a silicon oxide film having a specific concentration of halogen elements and carbon, which is used as an interlayer insulating film, as claimed in the present claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-26 and 35-62, when read in light of the specification, are adequately described and supported in the specification. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
PMB 955  
21010 Southbank Street  
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165  
(571) 434-6789